



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

NOV 30 1982

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



515302

OFFICE OF
SOLID WASTE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: USGS Assistance on Reilly Tar

FROM: Michael Kosakowski, Acting Chief
Compliance Branch

Michael Kosakowski

TO: Roy Murphy, Hydrogeologist
Support Branch

In accordance with the Interagency Agreement (IAG) between the USGS and EPA, I request the following assistance from the St. Paul, Minnesota Office for this fiscal year, assuming the IAG is continued past April 30, 1983.

1. Pursuant to item A in the IAG, I request that the USGS review drilling logs, to be provided from Minneapolis area well drilling firms, and classify the identity of geologic strata, if necessary, so that they correspond to the classifications previously given to GCA. This is to provide the EPA, USGS, and Minnesota Department of Health computerized geologic profiles of the Reilly Tar Site locale.

2. With the output of item one from GCA select 8 drilling locations to define where coal tar oils are in the Drift surrounding the Reilly Tar site.

3. Trial is expected to begin either during the Summer or Fall of 1983. Marc Hult has been designated by the Survey to be an expert witness for the trial pursuant to item E. In order to prepare for trial, Marc's attendance at meetings with the federal and state litigation teams is requested. These meetings occur on as needed basis, and several weeks advance notice is usually given. Most, if not all, meetings will be held in the Minneapolis area. On some occasions these meetings may occur in Chicago or Washington, D.C. Participation by the USGS at the latter may be requested, but I understand may not always be possible. At some meetings Marc has presented and may again be asked to give a presentation on his work at the Reilly Tar Site.

4. Review data and reports as per items B and C of the IAG. Examples are the GCA boring data, the draft CH2M Hill groundwater feasibility study, the soils feasibility study proposal and output, and Reilly Tar or ERT proposals. Output deadlines are negotiable on an individual basis. It should be recognized, however, that the closer we are to trial, the more critical the need for expedited review.

In summary, because this is one of the "rare cases" going to trial we request to exercise all the provisions of the IAG.